



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*U.S.*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,763	10/21/2005	John Thomas Brandt	X16303	3837

25885 7590 08/22/2006

ELI LILLY & COMPANY  
PATENT DIVISION  
P.O. BOX 6288  
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46206-6288

EXAMINER

GEMBEH, SHIRLEY V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1614

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/553,763

Applicant(s)

BRANDT ET AL.

Examiner

Shirley V. Gembeh

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on October 21, 2005 has been received and acknowledged.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-12 are pending in this office action.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: The abbreviation PCI, ACS, CVA and HRVD should be given as its full name or with the full name in parenthesis therewith when first used. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a method asserted utility or a well established utility.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1614

I. Claims 9 and 10 also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a method asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

II. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This is a written description rejection.

A lack of adequate written description issue arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (a "laundry list" disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not "reasonably lead" those skilled in the art to any particular species); *In re Ruschig*, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967).

An applicant may also show that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics which provide evidence that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention, i.e., complete or partial structure,

Art Unit: 1614

other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics.

The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. See *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

A "representative number of species" for the solvate, active metabolite, prodrug, racemate or enantiomer thereof means that the species which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus. The disclosure of only one species encompassed within a genus adequately describes a claim directed to that genus only if the disclosure "indicates that the patentee has invented species sufficient to constitute the gen[us]."

In other words, the Applicant has not described with sufficient clarity what these solvates, active metabolites, prodrugs, racemates or enantiomers thereof are.

III. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating a representative of cardiovascular

Art Unit: 1614

disease, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating or preventing heart disease, stroke, atherosclerosis, coronary heart disease, angina, coronary artery disease, hypertension and heart failure. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized in Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986) and reiterated by the Court of Appeals in In re Wands, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 at 1404 (CAFC 1988). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

The Board also stated that although the level of skill in molecular biology is high, the results of experiments in genetic engineering are unpredictable. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient amount for a prima facie case are discussed below.

#### Nature of the invention

The nature of the invention is methods of preventing cardiovascular disease in a patient, comprising administering the instant compound of formula I and its acceptable solvates, active metabolites, prodrugs, racemates or enantiomers to a patient in need thereof. As stated, however, claims 1-12 recite that any or a large representation of cardiovascular disease is intended.

State of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art

The state of the prior art is that it involves screening *in vitro* and *in vivo* to determine which compounds of claimed formula I and its' solvates, active metabolites, prodrugs, racemates or enantiomers exhibited the desired pharmacological activities (i.e. what compounds can treat which specific disease). There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face. The instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable as discussed below.

For example, "aging process" is known to causes specific cardiovascular changes that impair your heart and blood vessel function. These changes lead not only to reduced physical and mental ability, but getting older is also a risk factor for cardiovascular disease. How does one prevent aging related cardiovascular disease?

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. Further, their mode of action is often unknown or very unpredictable and administration of the drugs can be accompanied by undesirable side effects.

Thus, in the absence of a showing of correlation between some of or a representation of the diseases claimed as capable of being treated by compounds of the instant claims, one of skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from

Art Unit: 1614

the administration of the compounds due to the unpredictability of the role of the various compounds and the disease

Quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The quantity of experimentation needed is undue experimentation. One of skill in the art would first need to determine the type of cardiovascular disease to be treated, and then determine which of the large representation of compounds of formula I and its' solvates, active metabolites, prodrugs, racemates or enantiomers would be suitable for said treatment and/or prevention.

Amount of direction and guidance provided by the inventor.

The amount of direction or guidance present is found on pages 17-25 wherein *in tablet formulation are made (see pages 17-19 and how the compound is made pages 19-25 but no example on how the treatment was carried out is provided.* No *in vitro* activity and *in vivo* utility was shown, thus making it hard on the skilled artisan to make and use the claimed invention.

Existence of working examples.

Applicant's omission of working example does not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to treat the numerous amounts of diseases encompassed by the instant claimed compound and its' solvates, active metabolites, prodrugs, racemates or enantiomers.

Level of ordinary skill in the art.

The level of ordinary skill in the art is high. Due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by *in vitro* and/or *in vivo* screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.



Hence, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of the compounds of the claims for the treatment of any disease. As a result necessitating one of skill in the art to perform an exhaustive search to determine which diseases can be treated by what compounds of the instant claims in order to practice the claimed invention.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shirley V. Gembel whose telephone number is 571-272-8504. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 -5:00, Monday- Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/553,763

Page 9

Art Unit: 1614

SVG  
8/11/06

*Ardin H. Marschel 8/17/06*  
**ARDIN H. MARSCHEL**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**